

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

I. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

II. Claims 1, 5-9, and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites "said determining including examining a user domain received from a party seeking access" in lines 7-8. This limitation is not described in the specification as filed. Although the specification as filed does disclose examining a user domain of a party seeking access (see the Specification, page 4 at lines 20-33) **the specification does not** describe a user domain received from a party seeking access in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 5-8 and 15 are dependent on independent claim 1 and are rejected for new matter under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for the same reasons given above regarding independent claim 1.

Claim 9 recites "said common wireless network access point sending a guest credential to a guest user" in lines 4-5. This limitation is not described in the specification as filed. Although the specification as filed does disclose sending a guest credential to a guest user (see the Specification, page 4 at lines 7-16) **the specification does not** describe a common wireless network access point sending a guest credential to a guest user in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 9 recites "receiving a request for access from one of a guest and local user... examining if a user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain" in lines 6 and 9-10. This limitation is not described in the specification as filed. Although the specification as filed does disclose examining a user domain of a party seeking access (see the Specification, page 4 at lines 20-33) **the specification does not** describe a user domain received from a party seeking access in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 12-14 and 16 are dependent on independent claim 9 and are rejected for new matter under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for the same reasons given above regarding independent claim 9.

III. Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 9 recites "means coupled to the at least one common wireless network access point for routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest " in lines 16-17. This limitation is not described in the specification as filed in such a way as to provide enablement for the claimed subject matter. Although the specification as filed does provide enablement for routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest (see the Specification, page 5, lines 6-8) **the specification does not** provide enablement for a means coupled to the at least one common access point for routing traffic differently in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 9 recites "means for limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy" in line 17. This limitation is not described in the specification as filed in such a way as to provide enablement for the claimed subject matter. Although the specification as filed does provide enablement for limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy (see the Specification, page 2 at lines 21-22 and page 5, lines 6-8) **the specification does not** provide enablement for a means for limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 12-14 and 16 are dependent on independent claim 9 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement for the same reasons given above regarding independent claim 9.

Claim 14 recites “means for routing traffic includes a firewall” in lines 1-2. This limitation is not described in the specification as filed in such a way as to enable the claimed subject matter. Although the specification as filed does provide enablement for routing traffic through a firewall (see the Specification, page 3 at lines 25-27) **the specification does not** provide enablement for a means for routing traffic includes a firewall in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

IV. Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites “a wireless local area network for offering wireless network access to both guests and local users, comprising...means for limiting traffic”. This limitation fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because it is unclear how the wireless local area network relates to means for limiting traffic.

Claims 12-14 and 16 are dependent on independent claim 9 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness for the same reasons given above regarding independent claim 9.

Claim 14 recites "means for routing traffic includes a firewall" in lines 1-2. This limitation is fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because it is unclear how routing traffic relates to include a firewall.

Claim Objections

V. Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: It would be more clarifying if claims 9, 12-14 and 16 would consistently refer to the "at least one common wireless network access point" as the or said "at least one common wireless network access point" throughout the claim set. Appropriate correction is required.

Conclusion

VI. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Krantz et al. Patent No.: US 7,284,062 B2.

Meier et al. Patent No.: US 6,950,628 B1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon J Miller/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

March 31, 2011